

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4-14 and 16-22 are pending in the application and stand rejected.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 12-14, 16 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Moriwake et al. (US 2003/0117431).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a media file management unit that creates a search window that displays image data of media files to be searched and an edit window that displays image data of a media content file to be edited, when the media file is required to be edited, and searching and managing the media files through the search window or the edit window in accordance with the at least one control signal,

wherein the program application includes an external appliance select menu to display image data of media files stored in an information appliance selected by a user,

wherein the display screen is divided into the search window and the edit window when the user selects an edit menu in the program application,

wherein the search window and the edit window provide different menus when the search window and the edit window are focused by a user.

In the Response to Arguments section of this Final Office Action, the Examiner relies on Moriwake as disclosing the recited search window and edit window in the following manner:

(1) “search window” - citing library window 33 and FIG. 12, which shows still picture display part 33B; and

(2) “edit window: - citing time line window 51 of FIG. 12.

However, Moriwake fails to disclose “wherein the program application includes an external appliance select menu to display image data of media files stored in an information appliance selected by a user, wherein the display screen is divided into the search window and the edit window when the user selects an edit menu in the program application,

wherein the search window and the edit window provide different menus when the search window and the edit window are focused by a user,” as recited in claim 1.

In particular, Moriwake fails to disclose a program application that includes an external appliance select menu that displays image data of media files stored in an information appliance selected by a user. Rather, the library window 33, which shows material clips, only shows material clips that are stored and registered in the clip database CDB. *See* para. [0206]. As, such, this portion of Moriwake does not “display image data of media files stored in an information appliance selected by a user,” because the clips displayed are those of the clip database CDB of the editing system. *See* FIG. 1.

Thus, Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable for at least this reason. Additionally, because claims 12 and 20 recite similar features, Applicants submit these claims are allowable for the same reasons set forth above. Lastly, claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 13-14, 16 and 21-22 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 9-11, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriwake in view of Meyers et al., *A Multi-View Intelligent Editor for Digital Video Libraries* (2001).

In response, Applicants submit that because Meyers, either taken alone or in combination with Moriwake, fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Moriwake as set forth above with regard to claims 1 and 12, claims 9-11, 18 and 19 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriwake in view of Myers et al. (2001) in further view of Chernock et al. (US 6,229,524).

In response, Applicants submit that because Chernock, either taken alone or in combination with Moriwake and Meyers, fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Moriwake/Meyers as set forth above with regard to claim 1, claim 2 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependency.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 7 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriwake in view of Myers et al. (2001).

In response, Applicants submit that because Meyers, either taken alone or in combination with Moriwake, fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Moriwake as set forth above with regard to claims 1 and 12, claims 7 and 17 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
Application No.: 10/647,300

Attorney Docket No.: Q76059

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/David P. Emery/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 6, 2010

---

David P. Emery  
Registration No. 55,154